From: PETERSON Jenn L
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: rgensemer@parametrix.com; Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: Cadmium Fish Tissue TRV
Date: 07/29/2008 11:15 AM

Thanks for the update. The dioxin TRV is important because it is also applied to dioxin like PCB congeners. The fish TRVs just sent out for PCB are for aroclors as a total only, and do not consider dioxin like effects. I can send you information on the DEQ derived fish dioxin TEQ TRV, which was also based on SSD analysis. The number is 6.4 pg/g, compared to 90 pg/g that the LWG used. I am not sure if you were on the e-mail string on this, but using a lower number changes the conclusions esp. around RM7 (Rhone Poulenc). Based on my review of the Round 3 data, which is incomplete (they don't list a calculated TEQ) I would say there will be higher exceedances of the TEQ then we saw in Round 2 - e.g. PCB congener 126 alone was around 500 pg/g in the highest sample.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2008 10:49 AM
To: PETERSON Jenn L
Cc: rgensemer@parametrix.com; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Fw: Cadmium Fish Tissue TRV

Jennifer, I screened the fish tissue data. See below for my assessment. We cannot develop a SSD based tissue TRV for antimony due the lack of antimony studies. We will be developing fish tissue TRVs for cadmium and copper as a final batch of TRVs

Regarding dioxin, the question is whether we used the correct screening number. At this point, I need more information regarding the dioxin screening number to decide how to proceed. However, tissue TRVs for dioxin are not the highest priority for me since the risk based tissue concentrations protective of humans and wildlife that consume fish will drive the development of cleanup levels and these cleanup levels will be below background.

Eric
----- Forwarded by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US on 07/29/2008 10:43 AM -----

Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US 07/24/2008 04:21 PM		To "Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@parametrix.com> cc Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Carrie A. Smith" <CSmith@parametrix.com>, David DeForest <deforest@parametrix.com> Subject RE: Cadmium Fish Tissue TRV (Document link: Eric Blischke)

Well, I did a screen of the Round 3B invertebrate and fish tissue data. I focused on the chemicals presented in Appendix G2 and G3 of the Round 2 report. This list did not include VOCs and only considered select SVOCs (e.g., hexachlorobutadiene and hexachlorobenzene). Based on this evaluation, here are the additional chemicals for which we should develop TRVs:

Antimony - develop a fish tissue TRV based on detection of 10.9 mg/kg in smallmouth bass; exceeds screening level of 0.03 mg/kg. Cadmium - develop a fish tissue TRV based on detection of 0.283 in smallmouth bass; exceeds screening level of 0.09 mg/kg. Copper - develop a fish tissue TRV based on detection of 7.16 mg/kg in sculpin; exceeds screening level of 3.1 mg/kg.

Please let me know if I have the screening levels correct. Jennifer Peterson already identified two of these. I have confirmed these two (Sb and Cd).

If we all agree to develop TRVs for these chemicals, we will need to assess the effect on the overall schedule. As I indicated in my earlier email, we can add these as a TRV batch to be delivered at the end.

Eric

"Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@parametrix.com>
07/24/2008 01:11 PM

To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, David DeForest <deforest@parametrix.com>
cc: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Carrie A. Smith" <CSmith@parametrix.com>
Subject: RE: Cadmium Fish Tissue TRV

Thanks, Eric. This sounds like a good approach. I still favor prioritizing derivation of the existing list of tissue TRVs, then see how large a batch of "new" TRVs we might get after screening the 3B data. If its just a couple, it won't take too much extra time...we'll see what we get, I guess.

Let me know if you feel you need some help with the 3B screening. I'd like to keep David and Carrie focused on existing tissue TRVs for now of course, but I might be able to find someone else who could help with the screening if needs be. -Bob

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2008 12:48 PM
To: David DeForest
Cc: shephard.burt@epa.gov; Carrie A. Smith; Robert W. Gensemer
Subject: Re: Cadmium Fish Tissue TRV

I am trying to figure out if it is a priority and how many other chemicals that we may need to look at based on an evaluation of the Round 3B tissue data. If Cd were the only chemical - or even if there were 2 - 3 more, we may want to do them as a final batch. Right now, let's just track how many additional chemicals we may need to develop tissue TRVs for and then decide how to proceed. I will try to perform some sort of screen to identify any other potential chemicals.

Eric

David DeForest <deforest@parametrix.com>
07/24/2008 12:31 PM

To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: "Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@parametrix.com>, "Carrie A. Smith" <CSmith@parametrix.com>, Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Cadmium Fish Tissue TRV

Hi Eric-

Carrie passed along your message about a fish tissue TRV for Cd. I'm guessing it would take about 6-8 hrs to walk through the process for fish. This includes pulling all of the initial data from Burt's database and ERED, filtering the data for consistency with the approach memo, identifying key studies for additional review, tracking down these studies, and developing a write up summarizing the studies reviewed and selection of the TRV. There tends to be a lot of data for Cd, so the effort is larger than for most of the chemicals. To complete this we may need an extra day or two past the August 8 deadline for internal review, but will obviously send it out for review earlier if possible. Would you say that a fish TRV for Cd is a priority, or do you want to just see it carried along with the others we are working on?

Please let me know if any questions...

Kind regards,
David